

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated May 04, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 15-45 are currently pending. Claims 15-45 have been amended.

Interview Summary

On July 18, 2007, a telephonic interview occurred between Examiner Nawaz and Applicant's representative, Arno Naeckel. During the interview several amendments to claim 1 were discussed. For example, among others, amendments including adding means for interfacing a properties server with each of the plurality of client application servers and means for creating a plurality of configurable properties server objects, wherein each of the plurality of configurable properties server objects is configured to one of the client application servers in a round-robin fashion were discussed.

The Examiner indicated that the amendments would likely overcome the current prior art references and most likely be allowable.

103 Rejections

Claims 15-45 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Weschler (U.S. Patent 6,757,720) in view of Wischinski (U.S. Pat. 6,801,920). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 15-45

The Office Action rejects independent claim 15 by asserting that Weschler teaches most of the claims but concedes that Weschler fails to describe that the means for storing and maintaining comprises at least an APP table that maintains an entry for each application, a version table that maintains an entry for each version under each application and an APARM table that contains key value pairs. The Office Action asserts that Wischinski cures the deficiencies of Weschler. Applicants respectfully disagree.

However, in the interest of an efficient prosecution, independent claim 15 has been amended to include additional subject matter. Applicants respectfully point out that

Weschler fails to describe the additional subject matter recited in amended independent claim 15. Amended independent claim 15 recites, in pertinent part:

“[a]n application properties server network comprising...
means for interfacing a properties server with each of the plurality of client application servers;
means for creating a plurality of configurable properties server objects within the properties server, wherein each of the plurality of configurable properties server objects is configured to one of the client application servers in a round-robin fashion...
means for interfacing each of the configurable properties server objects with the means for storing and maintaining a system of configuration variable data; and
means for performing configuration services via the plurality of configurable properties server objects in response to configuration requests from said plurality of client application servers, said configuration services including providing configuration variable data to one of the client application servers in response to receiving an request for configuration variable data from the one client application servers, wherein the configuration request includes at least an application ID and a key, wherein further the key is a data string that identifies the configuration variable data being requested.”

For example, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Weschler nor Wischinski describes a “means for creating a plurality of **configurable properties server objects** within the properties server, wherein each of the plurality of **configurable properties server objects** is configured to one of the client application servers in a round-robin fashion” and “means for performing configuration services via the plurality of **configurable properties server objects** in response to configuration requests from said plurality of client application servers, said configuration services including providing configuration variable data to one of the client application servers in response to receiving an request for configuration variable data from the one client application servers, wherein the configuration request includes at least an application ID and a key, wherein further the key is a data string that identifies the configuration variable data being requested.”

The Office Action asserts that Weschler describes most of the claim elements. Specifically, the Office Action cites column 9, l. 3-42 and column 10, l. 41-65 of Weschler as describing a means for performing configuration services in response to configuration requests from a plurality of application servers. The means for configuration services in Weschler is described as being coupled to the plurality of

application servers where the configuration services include providing configuration variable data to an application server in response to a request.

Applicants respectfully point out that Weschler equates the *profile service instance* (201,202) in Weschler to the recited properties server (Col. 7, l. 40-45) and describes that multiple client applications may access a single profile service instance. (Col. 7, l.43-45; Col. 9, l. 3-5). Weschler describes that the profile instance is comprised of a profile engine 301 that is accessed by a client application 302 through a profile services API 303 that allows messages enabling the client application to request profile services from the profile engine 301. (Col. 9, l. 44-53).

The core profile engine 301 further comprises a profile manager object (i.e. a profile interface (Col. 14, l. 18-20)) and a **plurality of profile objects** (Col. 10, l 12-16) (e.g. the “profiles” per se (Figure 4, 400; Figure 5A; Col. 14, l. 17-19). The Profile API 303 accepts the message from the application and passes the message to the appropriate profile objects for execution within the core profile service engine 301 (i.e. profile retrieval from data stores 314)(Col 16, l. 55-60).

Weschler specifically describes that for each requested method (i.e. profile object) there is a **specific corresponding request message** generated by the client application server **used to access that method**. (Col. 16, l. 37-50). In other words, Weschler describes that there is a specific one-to-one correspondence between a particular requested method and a particular request message tasked to access that particular method (i.e. profile object).

As such, Weschler is not describing a plurality of configurable properties server objects, wherein each of the plurality of configurable properties server objects is **configured to one of the client application servers in a round- robin fashion**. Instead, Weschler is utilizing a system where profile objects are specifically configured to the request message and have a one-to-one correspondence to the specific request message. Since a specific request message is tasked to access a specific method the requested method is not **configured to one of the client application servers in a round-robin fashion**. The Weschler profile objects appear not to be configurable to the incoming request messages.

The Office Action proceeds by asserting that Wischinski cures the discrepancies of Weschler. Wischinski is concerned with remote configuration management and does not appear to concern itself with the creation or use of configurable properties server objects and therefore fails to cure this additional deficiency of Weschler.

Therefore, since none of Weschler, Wischinski or their combination describes “a means for creating a plurality of configurable properties server objects, wherein each of the plurality of configurable properties server objects is configured to one of the client application servers in a round robin fashion”, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. As such, amended independent claim 15 is allowable over the combination of Weschler and Wischinski for at least these reasons. Amended independent claims 26 and 35 contain similar recitations and are allowable for at least these same reasons. Claims 16-25, 27-34 and 36-45 depend from an allowable independent claim 1, 26 or 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 18, 26-34 and 40-41

The Office Action rejects claims 18 and 40 by asserting that Weschler describes that the means for interfacing said plurality of client application servers to said means for performing configuration services includes a common database access library. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Amended claim 18 recites, in pertinent part:

“means for interfacing said plurality of client application servers with the properties server includes a common database access library, wherein said common database access library allows changes in said means for performing configuration services without affecting said plurality of client application servers.”

The cited portion of Weschler (Col. 8, l. 21-43; Col. 16, l. 44-51) merely describes that protocol adapters (Items 304-305) send and receive messages to the client applications (Fig. 3, Col 9-l. 43-55). As such, any change in the means for performing configuration services down stream of the protocol adapters would necessarily affect the client application servers since the protocol adapters are merely translators. Any substantive changes in the means for performing configuration services would merely be passed through to the clients, thereby affecting them.

Wischinski is concerned with remote configuration management. Wischinski does not appear to concern itself with “a common database access library, wherein said common database access library allows changes in said means for performing configuration services without affecting said plurality of client application servers.” Therefore, Wischinski fails to cure this additional deficiency of Weschler.

Therefore, since Weschler fails to describe the subject matter asserted to Weschler by the Office Action and Wischinski fails to cure this additional deficiency of Weschler, the combination of Weschler and Wischinski fails to describe each and ever claim element. As such, the Office Action has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in regards to amended claim 18 which is allowable over the combination of Weschler and Wischinski for at least this reason. Claims 40 recite similar subject matter and are therefore allowable over the combination of Weschler and Wischinski for at least this same reason. Claim 40 depend from an allowable claim 40 and is allowable for at least this reason.

Amended independent claim 26 recites, in pertinent part: “[a] system for providing an application configuration service, comprising...a common database access library coupling the one or more application programming interfaces. As discussed above, none of Weschler, Wischinski or their combination describes a common database access library coupling the one or more application programming interfaces. As such, amended independent claim 26 is allowable over the combination of Weschler and Wischinski for at least this additional reason. Claims 27-34 depend from an allowable amended independent claim 26 and are allowable for at least this additional reason.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 15-45 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2007

/Arno Naeckel/

Arno Naeckel
Reg. No. 56,411

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(770) 518-9822